

Whereas despite these public hearings and despite a biased report on MH-30 by a U.S. Department of Agriculture interagency committee, the tobacco companies failed in their efforts to get a 50 percent discount rate on the 1963 tobacco crop; and

Whereas the latest attempt by the manufacturers and exporters to force their will on the tobacco growers by influencing through executive decree for identifying purposes the tagging of its tobacco treated with MH-30 and place the farmers completely at the mercy of the buyers; and

Whereas the fine cooperative spirit that has long existed between the farmer and buyer has been virtually destroyed by the aforementioned unscrupulous tactics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body condemn the subtle, insidious and secret methods attempted to discriminate against the tobacco farmers of the flue-cured and burley tobacco areas; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby invoke censure upon all of those responsible for the behind the scenes battle to arbitrarily impose their unjust scheme to achieve economic gain at the expense of the farmer; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby deplore the circumventing of democratic processes in this matter relating to the use of MH-30; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend, urge and request that congressional investigation be conducted immediately into all aspects of this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Senators and Representatives, the Governors and commissioners of agriculture of the States affected and to all companies purchasing tobacco in these tobacco belts.

In senate, read and adopted, March 5, 1963.

GEORGE D. STEWART,

Secretary.

In house, read and adopted, March 4, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,

Clerk.

CUBAN DISCLOSURES AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate on issues of foreign policy. It has never seemed to me that any reasonable concept of bipartisanship ruled out discussions—full and frank discussions—of such issues.

There is a distorted concept of bipartisanship which abhors Senate discussion. I am frank to say that it is sometimes espoused by Democrats in a Democratic administration just as readily as it is sometimes espoused by Republicans in a Republican administration. Bipartisanship, in this distortion, suggests that if you have something nice to say about the way foreign policy is being conducted, say it; otherwise do not say anything.

I think the record will show that I have never subscribed to that concept of bipartisanship in any administration, Republican or Democratic. Nor do I subscribe to it now. Mr. Kennedy did not subscribe to it as a Senator; nor does he now as President of the United States.

Cuba or any issue of foreign policy which may be of concern to the Ameri-

can people is of concern to the Senate. Bipartisanship does not constrain silence in these matters in the Senate. On the contrary, it compels consideration. But the highest interest of the people does place the restraints of national responsibility—not Democratic, not Republican, but national responsibility—on all of us. We need to select our words with caution and speak them with care. It does not matter whether we call these restraints bipartisanship, patriotism, common national sense or whatever. What does matter is that we remain ever aware that the margin for error is close in critical foreign policy issues, and we cannot afford to fill it up with politics as usual.

I question the motives of no Senator who may raise the Cuban question. It would be wise, however, if each Senator who deigns to speak on this dangerous matter examined consciously and conscientiously his own motives. Each of us might well ask himself three questions: First, am I talking for a partisan purpose? Second, am I talking with the full realization that my words may help to drive the people and the President's course toward war, limited or unlimited? Third, am I talking with the belief that my words will help the President in his primary task of safeguarding the security of the United States and its national reputation for honesty, integrity and decency while he attempts to exert a constructive influence for freedom and peace, not only with respect to Cuba, but throughout the hemisphere and the world?

I ask the Senate to ponder these questions. I ask each Senator to ponder them and his own silent responses to them, for these are questions which sooner or later each of us will have to answer to our own conscience, if not to our electorates.

I would ask all Senators to ponder the statement of the late Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg:

I think the Senate is entitled, at any time it pleases, to use the advice clause of the Constitution to tell the executive what it thinks concerning foreign affairs. But I think it would be a tragic and unfortunate thing if the habit ever became general or too contagious because I respectfully submit, * * * only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by some sort of premature and ill-advised expression of its advice to the executive.

If there is to be public criticism of policy, in short, let it be wise, dispassionate and constructive criticism. If the President's course is to be questioned, let reasonable alternatives be offered and let them be reasonably debated.

With that as background, Mr. President, let me say that I looked with favor on the revival of Senate discussion of the Cuban question some time ago. It seemed to me that in defusing the Soviet missile threat on the island—I would suggest that all of us, in the Senate and

in the Nation, recall our feelings at that time—the President had also set the stage for useful Senate discussion of the Cuban situation. It seemed to me that wise and dispassionate consideration in the Senate would open up new thought and new ideas from which the President might benefit in discharging his grave responsibilities on behalf of all of us.

There has, indeed, been discussion of Cuba, but little of it has been dispassionate and even less of it has been constructive. What has evolved, instead, has been a trial of policy by press releases, with the size and sensationalism of the headlines which they produce serving as evidence, judge and jury. Some days ago I cautioned against the course this discussion was taking. I made a plea on the floor for consideration of the President's grave burdens. I did not argue against discussion. I argued for discussion couched in the restraints of reason, the restraints of high national interest. These restraints have not been visible. In my opinion, much of the discussion of Cuba by Members of the Congress is not helping this Nation; it is hurting it. It is not helping the President; it is hindering him. We have indeed had discussions of Cuba, but a discussion steeped in politics, panic, and the perversion of fact.

I have been reluctant to reach this conclusion, for it reflects no credit on the Senate. Nevertheless, I am compelled to it by the recent discussion of the report that four American flyers lost their lives during the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion.

I did not wish to reveal the contents of the report which I am about to reveal, but I see no alternative. When the distinguished minority leader noted that he had just learned of the death of the four flyers, I was asked by the press to confirm it. I did so. I did not know why the distinguished minority leader raised the matter, but since it was raised by him—and he is a most responsible man—I saw no point in refusing to confirm the fact. I thought that would be an end to it, for I could not conceive of any earthly advantage to the Nation in a public delving in detail into this matter. And I could conceive of many, many disadvantages to the Nation.

But I was mistaken—very much mistaken—Mr. President, if I thought that would be an end to it. On the contrary, the matter has been pressed and pressed, and to what end? Are we going to get closer to a solution of this critical problem of Cuba if we know every gruesome detail of the death of these unfortunate men, if we ascertain that 4, 8, or 16 Americans lost their lives in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs venture? Just what is it—what national purpose is served by this macabre fixation? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries when we take a dark and obscure function and throw so much light on how it operates that whatever value it may have for the security of this Nation is seriously compromised thereby? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries

when we suggest—as this fixation does—that Cuban liberty can be bought with hired, well-paid American pilots, if only we hire enough and then not only hire them to fly but also give them a free hand to determine by their actions the course of U.S. policy? In this connection, I read from a U.P.I. story of March 7, 1963—only yesterday:

When failure of the invasion appeared sure * * * one of the American pilots proposed a plan to bring the United States into the conflict. Aircraft with Cuban markings would strafe runways and drop a few bombs on areas inside the naval base at Guantánamo.

This is no secret. This is from the news files of the United Press International, March 7, 1963—in other words, on yesterday.

Is this the way those who are looking for political profit in this affair would have the life-and-death questions of the Nation decided? Or will they stop playing with fire and get behind the President, the one man, the only man, whom the American people, in their wisdom, have chosen to make the critical decisions?

No, Mr. President, I see no national purpose served by this discussion. But I do see others. Examine for a moment, Mr. President, the context in which the drums have been struck and struck again on this matter of the death of the flyers. Clearly, the impression was permitted to gain national and international credence—and if Senators do not believe it, they can read the front pages of any newspaper in the Nation—that the tragic news of the loss of these men was suppressed by the Kennedy administration. And if the Kennedy administration would suppress this information, how much more, indeed, might it not be hiding in the dark archives of the White House and the State Department?

I now read to the Senate, Mr. President, a report which I have obtained on what occurred:

Four Americans flying for anti-Castro forces apparently were killed during the ill-fated Cuban invasion when their cargo plane crashed in the Caribbean.

A spokesman for a Miami concern that had put the Cuban rebels in touch with the flyers said the four had been missing since about April 19 and are presumed to have perished.

The spokesman, Alex E. Carlson, a Miami Springs lawyer, said he represented the Double Check Corp., a concern that acted as a broker in locating flyers for Cubans attempting to overthrow Premier Fidel Castro.

Mr. Carlson identified the missing flier as Riley W. Shamburger, the pilot; Thomas W. Ray, copilot; Leo F. Baker, engineer; and Wade C. Gray, radioman, all residents of Birmingham.

That report, Mr. President corroborates the story which has recently been revealed to the press by Members of the Congress. It was this report which I have in my possession which more than anything else led me to confirm the story recently released with all the tense trappings of an uncovered skeleton in the closet of the Kennedy administration. Where did I get this report which I have just read, Mr. President? Did I copy it from those who have recently revealed it with such shocking impact? Did I ferret

it out of the White House or the State Department? What is its classification? "Secret"? "Top Secret"? "Eyes only"?

I read the source, Mr. President: Dateline Birmingham, Ala., May 4—AP— from the New York Times, May 5, 1961—1961—page 11.

One year and 9 months ago, Mr. President, in the public press, we find the same story that is now being used as an uncovered secret to cast doubt on the veracity and honesty of the administration. This then is the great new revelation, the sensational new discovery, which set the tone for the revival of a great debate on Cuba, a news item which first appeared in the press a year and 9 months ago. Is this the sort of thing that helps the Nation? Is this the sort of thing that shed light on a most difficult and complex and dangerous situation? Is this the sort of thing that represents a responsible contribution by a responsible opposition to the Nation's policies on which the security and good name of the Nation depend? Or is it a glaring example of irresponsible politics, of panic politics at their worst? That is a cruel thing, Mr. President, to do to the families of those who died, and it is a reckless thing to do to the conduct of foreign policy. It would seem to me that those who have sought to build this matter into a mountain of suspicion and distrust of the President owe an apology to Mr. Kennedy. But even more, they owe an apology to the people of this Nation.

Mr. President, the CIA, under its Director, John A. McCone, performs a useful and necessary service for the people of the Nation. It has been very frank in attempting to put the facts before the Congress—in my opinion, too frank, considering the nature of its work. I think it is about time that those who directly or by innuendo charge that the administration is "managing the news" on Cuba acknowledge that these demands, if met, can only lead to a total compromising of the work of this Agency, an embarrassment not of the President but of the Nation. Perhaps that is not too large a price to pay for full information. Each Senator will have to make that equation for himself. But it seems to me that if full disclosure is what is desired, Senators might well consider drastically curtailing this function and this agency. For, in my opinion, the Nation will be done less harm by that course than by a public examination of each and every detail of these operations.

I say once more what has been said before, it would be best for those who have a penchant to play CIA Chief, Secretary of State and Defense to turn their attention to the legislative chores which confront them, to the needs of the people of the United States. If we must be the sleuths, let us find the culprits in the state of the Nation's sluggish economy. Let us get on with a tax cut which will strengthen the financial position of millions of Americans. Let us take an honest look at the principle of equal opportunity for all Americans, and how it is operating in practice. Let us probe in depth the educational needs of the Nation and the health and hospitalization needs. Let us take a hard look at

the strangulation and the decay of our cities. Let us penetrate in depth into the questions posed by automation and persistent unemployment now at a 6.1-percent figure.

These are matters of immense concern to the present and future of this Nation, no less serious than Cuba or any other problem of foreign policy. And it will take Senators and Representatives, not sleuths, to deal with them. It will take a hard wrestle with reality to face these facts and to devise public policies for dealing with them. The President has proposed. It is about time that this Congress began to dispose.

Let me reiterate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Montana still has no objection to dispassionate discussion of the Cuban situation on the floor of the Senate. However discouraging this political prowling over the dead may be, the Senator from Montana is still hopeful that reason will prevail in this body on Cuban policies and that this body will yet make the contribution which it can make. And so he welcomes the continuance of the discussion. But let me say again, if we are to call shots in this delicate arena as we see them, let us be reasonably certain that we have seen them before we call them. And if we are to try to move the cautious and deliberate policies of the President off the course of national peace, national security, and international decency, on which he has tried to set them, let us be sure of our intentions. If there are those who would continue with this reckless flaming of public emotions, let them at least acknowledge what they are about. This is not a child's game. It is not a TV thriller. To continue to toy with these questions as has been done in the recent past is to toy with the life of the Nation.

HARTKE URGES SUPPORT OF OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on my return from Africa last December, I urged through correspondence, Hon. Luther Hodges, the Secretary of Commerce, to consider the establishment of a Senior Peace Corps, comprised of retired businessmen who could devote some of their time to teaching their know-how to businessmen in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Everywhere I went in Africa, there was a desire for American business methods, which are admired by nearly all Africans. Also, they seem to be impressed with the hard work that is a badge of most American businessmen.

I assumed that if this were true in Africa, it must be true in other underdeveloped countries, such as some of our neighbors to the south of us in Latin America and South America.

For several weeks now Secretary Hodges, his assistant, Dr. Jack N. Behrman, officials of the Agency for International Development, the State Department, and I have discussed this most important project.

Recently the Agency for International Development announced that a pilot project, using the idea of a peace corps, comprised of senior or retired business-

Jr., appealing to churches and synagogues to "bury religious laissez faire in racial problems." The need, the Peace Corps Director said, is for social action programs which will produce concrete gains. Such programs could end segregation in churches where it now exists, Shriver suggested, and "Introduce Negroes to every social and community event which the church sponsors or participates in."

It is difficult to generalize about the role of the churches in combatting the evils of discrimination. Even in the Deep South, where strictly segregated congregations are the rule, there is a wide range of opinion among laymen as to the morality of discrimination and many religious leaders have spoken out courageously against it.

But we think it will be generally agreed that even in the North, the example set by such leaders often does not reach deeply enough into congregations. As Shriver suggests, the example is frequently not translated into social action on behalf of basic principles.

It has been our impression, one sustained by inquiry, that Minneapolis churches and synagogues are generally outstanding in their dedicated work on behalf of these principles. The part played by various religious groups in combatting residential segregation and their efforts to educate the citizen to his responsibilities under Minnesota's newly effective Fair Housing Act, clearly suggests the presence of a powerful leaven of conscience which does not stop short of action.

We do not mean to imply that much more could not be done by these groups or by the congregations which they represent. But the picture often drawn of a spiritual leadership reluctant to war on discrimination, and of a lay leadership indifferent to inequalities of racial opportunity does not, in our opinion, apply to this community.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Conference on Religion and Race was a most relevant expression of the same concern for human values that prompted President Lincoln to promulgate the Emancipation Proclamation. I commend the persons responsible for conceiving and organizing this inter-religious conference of historic significance.

A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY— CUBA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was conducting an executive hearing of the Internal Security Subcommittee. In consequence, I was late in getting to the floor, and therefore did not hear the statement made by the majority leader with respect to a continuing discussion of certain problems relating to Cuba. He was kind enough to let me see the manuscript of his remarks. I believe it is appropriate that I make at least this one comment.

I was curious, when, 20 months after the Bay of Pigs incident, and after it had lain dormant all that time, the Attorney General should see fit to bring the matter out on the front page of the newspapers. I was curious as to the reason and why, after it had languished for 20 months, new life was being breathed into what was, at the time it happened, a controversy.

I have an interest only in the truth. It was written on the ancient parchment, long ago:

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

I think that is good gospel and that is good philosophy and that is sound doctrine for government.

It was in pursuance of that doctrine that I laid the matter before the policy committee of my own party and asked whether they thought it ought to be explored and whether a further report should be made on it. I have been exploring it, although it has not been necessary for me to energetically explore it, because it has explored itself from time to time. The letters, telephone calls, and telegrams and other material which have come to me bearing upon the matter indicate that there is a high degree of public interest in this subject. I have been exceedingly circumspect in anything I have said with respect thereto. I have sought under no circumstances to prejudge the matter. I leave that to take place after an appropriate committee of the Senate, where both parties have representation may, after an evaluation of the testimony, has come to a conclusion, and when one can ask any member of the newspaper fraternity. That is as much as anyone has received from the minority leader on this point.

It was only when a distinguished Member of the Senate, on a television performance, indicated that it was "spilled milk" that I, perhaps inadvertently, mentioned that spilled milk is one thing, but spilled blood is quite another. When he said, "What do you mean by spilled blood?" I said, "Well, I simply mean that perhaps Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs operation, and you don't lightly cast aside spilled American blood."

I left it right there. But they worked their own will. They worked their own thinking upon that little morsel. May it be said to the everlasting commendation of the majority leader that he did then state on the floor of the Senate or in a press conference that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs.

I asked nobody for confirmation. I was no party to any conference or any session, at the White House or elsewhere, where such a disclosure was made. But the majority leader stated, so that all the world could note, that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Of course, it is no wonder that this disclosure has seized upon the imagination of our people. It is small wonder that it has intrigued the interest of the press. So people continue to conjecture: What was the truth? What is the truth? What did happen? That is the only interest I have in the matter. I do not like to see a gap in contemporary history that may someday be referred to as the Bay of Pigs gap.

If there is any merit in the old expression, it would have merit now; that is, that open confession is good for the soul. So why not lay all the facts upon the record and let us have done with it? Then the whole truth shall have been told, and our people shall have been sat-

isfied on that point. If there are other questions appertaining to Cuba which need discussion, they can be raised when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is chairman of a subcommittee which is investigating the question, will finally make his report.

So, Mr. President, for myself, I must insist that my own approach to the matter has been most circumspect. I have at no time and under no circumstance undertaken to prejudge the matter. I leave it right there until such time as an appropriate group or subgroup of this body can go into the subject further.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was very sorry to read in the morning newspapers that the Republican leadership has announced its determination to fight the bill which is now before the Senate—S. 20. I think it would be well for the Senate, particularly the Republican leadership, to understand the background and origin of S. 20 and exactly what it seeks to do.

Public Law 85-470 of the 85th Congress, signed by Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower on June 28, 1958, created an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The Commission was composed of four Senators and four Representatives, equally divided between the two political parties, plus seven public members appointed by President Eisenhower. Mr. Eisenhower appointed as the Chairman of the Commission Mr. Laurence Rockefeller, of New York. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON and I served on the Commission. Republican Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and WATKINS, of Utah, served on it for a time. They were succeeded by Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho, and Senator Thomas Martin, of Iowa. Senator Martin was succeeded by Senator JACK MILLER, of Iowa.

In 1961, when President Kennedy took office, Senator ANDERSON asked him to retain the Commission as it was constituted, even though it was predominantly Republican. This was done.

The Commission reported on January 31, 1962, after a 3-year study, including many detailed research projects. The Commission found—and I wish to emphasize that the findings were unanimous:

The [recreation] demand is surging. Whatever the measuring rod—visits to the Federal and State recreation areas, fishing license holders, the number of outboard motors in use—it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a foretaste of what is to come.

Not only will there be many more people, they will want to do more, and they will have more money and time to do it with.

Recreation "activity occasions" ran 4.4 billion in 1960. It is estimated that by 1976 they will run 6.9 billion. They will be more than 12.4 billion—tripled—by

2000. These calculations are based on extensive studies, including a poll of 18,000 persons by Census Bureau for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report continues:

After 3 years of research, and an aggregate of some 50 days of discussion among the Commissioners, the Commission has developed specific recommendations for a recreation program. The 15 members brought differing political, social, and resource-use opinions. During the course of the study and discussion, views of the individual members developed, and the collective opinion crystallized. The final recommendations are a consensus of the Commission.

Here on the very first page of the report are the personal signatures of every one of the 15 members—proof of their individual agreement to the statement and to the fact that the report was the unanimous consensus of all of us.

I invite the attention of Senators to the names of members of the Commission who signed the report, which is the basis for the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

The Chairman was Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York, N.Y.

From the U.S. Senate: Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; the late Senator Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; the junior Senator from Washington, Senator Jackson; and Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa.

From the House of Representatives, Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; former Representative Gracie Pfoz, of Idaho; Representative Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska; and Representative John H. Kyl, of Iowa.

The Presidential Commissioners appointed—and I again emphasize that they were appointed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower—were:

Samuel T. Dana, dean emeritus of the School of Natural Resources, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, associate director of special activities, the New York Times, New York, N.Y.

Bernard L. Orrell, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash.

Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, Washington, D.C.

M. Frederik Smith, vice president, Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N.J.

Chester S. Wilson, former Minnesota State Commissioner of Conservation, Stillwater, Minn.

All these individuals were appointed by President Eisenhower, with the exception of Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, who was appointed by President Kennedy in, I believe, 1961 by reason of the death of one of the members.

Mr. President, the names to which I have just now referred give the background and parentage of the recommendations which are before us. Certainly this group is composed of distinguished Americans who have been appointed without regard to party. The entire

burden of the effort of the Commission was to do an effective, nonpartisan job, so that we could get a report which would result in general agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from the State of Washington for yielding to me.

I wish to say that I think the Commission, which was appointed by President Eisenhower without regard to party, was an excellent one, and made an excellent report to the present administration.

I had hoped, and I still hope, that the extremely important recreation industry and its development and expansion will not become involved in any way in party politics. It would seem to me to be very shortsighted, indeed, to let that happen.

Recreation is one of the most rapidly growing industries in the United States today, and it shows signs of growing in the future at an even more rapid rate.

With the development of technology and assembly-line production, it has become possible for our industrialists to turn out the same amount of equipment of all kinds with much less labor than the amount previously required. Now we must find some way to take up the slack in employment which automation is creating; and the recreation industry lies immediately before us, waiting to be developed to several times its present size. That is particularly true in the part of the country which I represent.

Not only would the recreation industry take up the slack in employment, insofar as operating recreational areas goes, but in recent years there has been developed in the recreation field a demand for much new equipment which was not even on the market a few years ago; and this demand creates new industries and new employment in them.

The recreation industry has created a great new field for investment in this country. Even in our small State of Vermont we see millions of dollars of new money being put into recreation areas annually and thus creating new markets for recreational articles and new jobs for persons who otherwise perhaps would be unemployed. All of this, Mr. President, contributes to the taxable income of the country. I know small towns in my State which 10 or 20 years ago contributed virtually no taxes to the State, but now make very substantial tax contributions, not only on the property there and not only through the employment taxes on those who work in these areas, but also through the tobacco taxes, the gasoline taxes, and all the other taxes. If that tax income were to be lost, its loss could spell disaster to the economy of the State.

In addition, Mr. President, we must consider the agricultural situation of the country. In that connection, in order to keep in economic competition, farmers have had to change their way of do-

ing business. They have had to double or treble the size of their farms, and they have had to purchase new machinery. All this has meant that thousands of small, uneconomic farms have had to be taken out of production. Then how were the small farms used? They were used as residential property; and more particularly, they now contribute to the recreation industry, for today there is a great demand for living accommodations for people who wish to come for a week or a month, or even to live there indefinitely.

In one ski area in Vermont, the manager of the operations told me that presently there is a shortage of 2,500 beds in that one area, and that 2,500 additional beds are needed in order to take care of those who wish to come from other parts of the Nation to visit or live there.

Mr. President, if we were to restrict this development in any way, if we were to turn down cold the recommendations which this Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower, has made, we would literally be taking the bread out of the mouths of our people, and possibly the recovery from the economic shock and loss caused by such action would not occur during this generation.

So I wish to support the Senator from Washington, and to state that I hope there will be no partisan position on this legislation or on legislation of this type. I hope we shall—as we did last year—enact this bill unanimously, so there could be no question about where we stand, and so that no one could charge any of us with obstructing the development of what is possibly one of the most rapidly growing industries in the Nation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont. As usual, he has approached this problem—as he has approached so many other problems—in a statesmanlike way.

It would be most unfortunate if this matter were to become a subject of bitter partisanship. Actually, Mr. President, if the objective is economy and saving money, then the implementation of this proposal, by both the Federal Government and the States, will be a way to achieve it. It will avoid a waste, both of human and of material resources. The States are undertaking all sorts of programs in this area; and those programs need to be coordinated with the programs of the Federal Government. We have an opportunity through S. 20 to utilize the resources of the Federal Government, and also those of the States, to carry out a long-range, coordinated program to deal with problems arising out of what has been so commonly referred to as the great population explosion.

As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, many great problems which are arising socially, economically, and politically as a result of our rapidly changing industrial technology. Our need is to find proper areas for recreation, not only for the youth of the country, but also for our older citizens. This

1963

bill—S. 20—is part of a desire on the part of all citizens—Republicans and Democrats alike—to meet sensibly this great demand which faces us.

This is not a wild-eyed program. I do not think Laurance Rockefeller and other businessmen on the Commission would jump off the deep end with a program which would hurt the economy of the Nation. This is a realistic program.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] pointed out that a number of industries in our country have been growing and flourishing—in fact, they are called growth industries—because they are oriented toward the recreational needs and requirements of our people. Recreation is giving employment and new opportunities for business and for working men and women throughout America. I wish to commend the Senator for the point that he has made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am speaking not only for myself personally, but I am also speaking for my State, which supports the bill (S. 20) and the subsequent bill (S. 859) which was introduced by the Senator from Washington, and upon which hearings are now being held. The State Director of Forests and Parks for Vermont had intended to testify in favor of that proposed legislation before the Interior Committee, but unfortunately we had too much snow, sleet, and rain, so that the planes did not fly and he did not get here. But he has sent me his testimony, which I have asked to have inserted in the record of the hearings. So I wish it understood that I am speaking not only for myself alone—although I believe everything that I have said—but I am also representing the position of my State.

Mr. JACKSON. We appreciate that. I think it should be brought to the attention of Senators that the bill before the Senate is a bipartisan bill. It is supported not only by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from Washington, but also the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], as well. We hope that the whole problem can be approached from that point of view. If we fail to do so, I think we will be rendering a great disservice to the country as a whole.

Mr. President, I should now like to turn to some of the recommendations made by the Commission.

The Commission made extensive and very detailed recommendations to meet the tremendously expanded recreation demand which is ahead.

They recommended not only a national recreation policy—by unanimous consensus of all the members—but also many specific steps which should be taken to implement that policy.

The national recreation policy unanimously recommended on page 6 of the report before me states:

It shall be the national policy, through the conservation and wise use of resources, to preserve, develop, and make accessible to all American people such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment and to assure the physical, cultural, and spiritual benefits of outdoor recreation.

Implementation of this policy will require the cooperative participation of all levels of Government and private enterprise. In some aspects, the Government responsibility is greater; in others, private initiative is better equipped to do the job.

The role of the Federal Government should be:

1. Preservation of scenic areas, natural wonders, primitive areas, and historic sites of national significance.
2. Management of Federal lands for the broadest possible recreation benefit consistent with other essential uses.
3. Cooperation with the States through technical and financial assistance.
4. Promotion of interstate arrangements, including Federal participation where necessary.
5. Assumption of vigorous, cooperative leadership in a nationwide recreation effort.

To implement this policy, the Commission recommended, among many others, the following specific steps:

It recommended that we set up and adopt a national classification system for outdoor recreation areas, to facilitate understanding, planning and management.

It recommended that every State develop a statewide recreation plan.

It recommended systematic and continuing research, both fundamental and applied, to provide the basis for sound planning and decisions.

At page 9 of the voluminous report it recommended as follows:

A BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

A Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be established in the Department of the Interior. This Bureau would have overall responsibility for leadership of a nationwide effort, by coordinating the various Federal programs and assisting other levels of Government to meet the demand for outdoor recreation.

Specifically, the new Bureau would—

1. Coordinate the recreation activities of the more than 20 Federal agencies whose activities affect outdoor recreation.
2. Assist State and local governments with technical aid in planning and administration, including the development of standards for personnel, procedures, and operations.
3. Administer a grants-in-aid program to States for planning and for development and acquisition of needed areas.
4. Act as a clearinghouse for information and guide, stimulate, and sponsor research as needed.
5. Encourage interstate and regional cooperation, including Federal participation where necessary.

WHAT S. 20 WOULD DO

The Secretary of the Interior established the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation on April 2, 1962, in response to the report, issued January 31, 1962.

In other words, Secretary of the Interior Udall carried out the specific recommendations of the unanimous report of a bipartisan commission headed by Mr. Laurance Rockefeller.

The Bureau will do exactly what the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended.

Secretary of the Interior Udall transferred planning and State cooperation functions to it from National Park Service—duties imposed on that Service, as we all know, under the act of June 23, 1936. These functions were transferred and placed in the new Bureau. Secretary Udall did not have the other powers and authorities, as recommended by the Commission, to transfer to the new Bureau. So Congress has been asked to provide the authorities. The bill (S. 20) now before the Senate would direct and authorize the Secretary, through the Bureau, to first, maintain an inventory; second, prepare a system of classification of types of recreation areas; third, develop a nationwide plan, built on State plans; fourth, provide technical assistance as ORRRC proposed; fifth, encourage interstate and regional cooperation; sixth, sponsor, conduct, and assist in research; and seventh, encourage Federal departments and agencies to cooperate.

Incidentally, I might comment here that, the wonderful cooperation that now exists between Secretary of the Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is to be most highly commended. They appeared jointly before the committee yesterday to testify together in support of other proposed legislation in this same general field.

Eighth, to encourage donations to the cause—money, lands, and other property that may be of help.

BUREAU IN EXISTENCE

The next point I wish to make is that the Bureau is in existence. Last year \$1.1 million was transferred to it from the Park Service budget. In other words, the funds that the Park Service had for the functions that I have mentioned were transferred to the new Bureau. In the 1964 budget, which is now before the Congress, the request is for \$2.2 million. What I desire to emphasize is that this will be a small bureau, a service organization, and not a land-management agency. The director, Dr. Crafts, has testified that, as far as he can see, at the very outside the budget will never go beyond \$5 million. It will probably be considerably less than that, as a matter of fact at the peak.

There is no money authorization in the bill, because the Bureau is already in existence; and is a budgeted agency.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about the fact that this will be a sound, sensible, first step toward carrying out the unanimous recommendations of a very able commission, a commission which has approached the problem without regard to partisanship. I think it would be a serious mistake if the proposed legislation were even to pass the Senate by a narrow vote. Certainly it will pass, but I do not think it would encourage fairminded citizens, regardless of party, to undertake work in behalf of such important programs as the matter now pending before the Senate, if the programs are to be turned into partisan political footballs.

President Eisenhower tried to select people uniquely qualified to serve on the Commission, to approach the problems without regard to partisanship. Presi-

dent Kennedy has followed the same approach, with the same attitude. President Kennedy is now seeking to carry out recommendations made by the original Eisenhower Commission.

Mr. President, I hope that when the Senate votes on Tuesday, it will give a resounding vote of confidence and support to all Americans, to all of our citizens who are interested in dealing with our recreation resources, and the future well-being of our children. I hope the Senate will give a large, healthy—even overwhelming—majority vote in support of the pending bill, S. 20.

BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, yesterday I adverted to certain incidents surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba in April 1961, and I expressed then, as I express now, my sympathy to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in that ill-fated incident.

Reference has been made in this Chamber today, to that invasion, and reference has also been made to it by the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon. I should like to make some supplementary remarks on this same subject.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that any American men were killed in that abortive invasion. It is a matter of great regret that four fine American young men had the misfortune to be shot down.

The facts are that all of the four were mature men. One had been a test pilot, and a former World War II pilot. He was 37 years of age. His name was Riley W. Shamburger, Jr. It is stated that he received \$2,100 per month while he was training Cubans as aviators preliminary to the invasion, presumably in Nicaragua and Guatemala.

The second man referred to in the news item was, Thomas Ray, I find, 30 years of age at the time, and had just returned from military duty. Evidently he was not employed at the time he enrolled at \$1,900 a month to train Cubans.

The third, Wade C. Gray, was unemployed at the time he was hired. He had been a radio and electronics technician. He was 33 years of age.

The fourth man, Lee F. Baker, was 35 years of age. He operated a pizza establishment, and also had worked as a pilot.

So, Mr. President, they were mature men. They were either recruited, or offered their services; one at \$2,100 a month and the others at \$1,900 a month. Their recruitment was for the purpose of training Cuban exiles. Their recruitment was not for the purpose of combat duty. Evidently in the excitement of the moment at the time of the invasion, realizing there was a need for trained pilots, they voluntarily took over the controls of two planes. Unfortunately, both of them were shot down.

Since that time there have been statements back and forth regarding these men. Let us accept the statements of the unfortunate widows, the mothers of their children, that their hus-

bands were not soldiers of fortune. But they were mature men who entered this perilous work, one might say, at high salaries. Their widows are presently receiving \$487 a month.

Mr. President, I have done some research on the subject of pensions for widows of servicemen killed in combat. If a captain in the Air Force serving in World War II were shot down, as these men serving in the invasion were, the widow of that captain, without a child, would be entitled to receive approximately \$164 a month from a grateful government until such time as she remarried.

Unfortunately, during World War II many Air Force officers with the rank of captain who had little children were shot down.

If the widow had one child, she would be receiving, from a grateful government, \$205 a month up to the time that the child reaches 18 years of age. With two children, the widow would receive \$225 from our Government. When her children reach 18—and presumably they have by this time—the payment of the pension to the widow, if she has not remarried, would revert to \$164.

I stated yesterday that some of the widows of our men in World War II, who left their comfortable homes and loved ones and made the ultimate sacrifice for their country, and who today are receiving \$164 a month, must be somewhat surprised to read in the papers that the widows of these four unfortunate pilots who were killed at the Bay of Pigs invasion in April of 1961 are receiving \$487 a month and expect to receive that amount as long as they remain unmarried.

I make these remarks only to show what our Government has done and what is being done—I do not know for sure by whom. It may be the Central Intelligence Agency or an organization of Cuban freedom fighters, many of whom are sons of men of wealth in Cuba who were dispossessed. Presumably it is not from that source. I have no knowledge on the subject, but my view is that it may be the Central Intelligence Agency that is making the payments.

That leads me to the conclusion that it would be an excellent idea for the Congress to legislate and select a joint watchdog committee to keep the CIA under observation and see that the expenditures of the organization are properly made. Sometimes, when agencies of our Government have ample funds to spend, some of the officials may not always be zealous in the interest of saving taxpayers' money. My belief is that our Central Intelligence Agency is over staffed and is spending too much of the taxpayers' money. Frankly, I could not prove that. No Member of Congress could. This is another reason why there should be a joint committee of Congress to act as watchdog, and to keep the expenditures and operations of the CIA under constant scrutiny.

Frankly, Mr. President, I have supported appropriations for the defense of our country, which includes tremendous sums for the CIA. I am fearful that having available such huge funds and

being top heavy with executives has encouraged this agency to be spendthrift on occasions. It is high time we become more vigilant and work hard to cut out unnecessary spending and lop off unneeded personnel in the CIA and other agencies.

Mr. President, I wish to add one concluding thought which comes to me because I have just taken from the bulletin board a report of a statement by former Vice President Nixon, who said in an interview that he has changed his mind about withdrawing from public life.

That is not surprising, and he certainly has the right to change his mind about retiring from public life. It occurs to me it is quite likely that he will try to continue in public life and in the end become California's Harold Stassen. Richard Nixon and Harold Stassen have both in the past been the wonder boys of the Republican Party. I recall that Harold Stassen served as Governor of Minnesota, and then sought the presidential nomination of that Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member, but which I hold in the highest respect. He later occupied an exceedingly high position in the Eisenhower administration.

Finally, as I recall, I believe he ran for the city council in Philadelphia and was defeated.

Mr. President, Mr. Nixon, according to this news item, charged that President Kennedy blundered by failing to provide air cover for the invasion that could have toppled, he says, the Fidel Castro regime, and, he says, former President Eisenhower would never have made that mistake.

The fact is that in 1960, when General Eisenhower was President of the United States, and this California Stassen, Mr. Nixon, was Vice President of the United States, the Castro regime suddenly, and without warning, seized the property of American citizens in Cuba; seized, for instance, millions of dollars of the property of American corporations which were lawfully in Cuba.

Fidel Castro made no pretext then, and has made no pretext since, of giving any payment whatever to corporations owned by American stockholders, or to American individuals when he despoiled them of their properties.

Was there a peep out of the Vice President at that time about a quarantine against Cuba? Was there an utterance from the then President of the United States about invading Cuba? Firm action would have been justified. Vice President Nixon did not utter one yelp, one cry of protest at that time. Now he is talking big. He wants to be a War Hawk in 1963, but he was extremely silent in 1959 and 1960, when the then administration and its leaders also had a real grievance against Castro's Cuba.

I support the firm, determined, resolute, and unyielding policy toward Cuba of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I am proud of the fact that his policy caused Khrushchev to turn tail last October and to withdraw the aggressive missiles and the aggressive planes from that little island.

1963

3621

I am proud, as a supporter of the foreign policy of the administration, that we are pursuing a policy of isolation and insulation against Castro's Cuba. In the end, despite what the new War Hawks, such as Mr. Nixon, have to say, I am certain that Castroism and Castro himself will be ousted entirely from the Western Hemisphere, due to the wise policy of the administration.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of answering my very able friend from Ohio, except to say that the hazards which confront this Nation are common to all the American people and that the incorrect decisions which are attributable to the man in the White House—any man in the White House—concern all of us. No one devoted more zeal or more courage to the cause of America and a just peace in the world than the gallant man from Gettysburg, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I remember that when Eisenhower finally decided to break off diplomatic relations with the infamous Castro regime this Chamber resounded with imprecations from some quarters against him for taking that step. I remember how proud I was when I stood on the floor to see the Democratic majority leader join the Republican minority leader in urging the Senate to approve legislation in the field of sugar and sugar quotas, by which that ugly Communist island would be prohibited from profiting from the sale of its sugar to this country. The Senate approved the Eisenhower bill only to see it die in the House. It is to the credit of the present Chief Executive of the United States, John F. Kennedy, that when he became President he asked Congress to enact the same kind of law recommended by a Republican administration and Congress did at long last do so.

Therefore, I simply say that in my opinion there is no need for anyone to defend the illustrious career in the White House of Dwight Eisenhower and of the Vice President at that time, Richard Nixon.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GALLANT NANCY BOYD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during its brief period of operation, the Peace Corps has won global admiration for the devotion, perseverance, willingness, and zeal of self-sacrificing men and women, of all ages and from every walk of life, who answered a unique call to service in the interest of democracy and of humanity.

The performance of the Corps indeed has demonstrated in remote corners of the earth the lofty ideals of America and the limitless sympathy which our Nation feels for those in less fortunate circumstances.

When they responded to the call, the Peace Corps volunteers signified a complete readiness to assume extraordinary responsibilities. They eagerly underwent rigorous training. They were content with unusually modest compensa-

tion. They were prepared to undergo physical hardship and to embark upon a mode of living far removed from the comfortable circumstances to which they were accustomed.

Now, in a tragic airplane accident in a foreign land, two members of the Peace Corps have given their lives. A resident of my State of California, Miss Nancy Boyd, of Martinez, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, was one. The other was Philip Water Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo.

Miss Boyd early joined this constructive program because she felt she could make a worthwhile contribution as a teacher, carrying the message of independence and self-determination and the dignity of man to younger generations who ultimately will be charged with keeping the flame of freedom glowing. In less than a year, as a member of the seventh contingent of volunteers sent to the Philippine Republic, this young woman, who received her training at San Jose State College in California, lay dead in the wreckage of a commercial airliner which crashed on Mindanao Island.

This patriotic young Californian, motivated by thoughts of the great opportunity offered in inculcating a love of liberty along with precious knowledge in children of another race and in a distant country, will be long remembered as a heroine of the cold war. I wish to pay tribute to her loyalty and her dedication to the cause for which she gave her life.

With these remarks, I wish to extend deepest sympathy to her parents and as evidence of the esteem and appreciation felt for her I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a message of sympathy from the President of the Philippine Republic, along with a letter from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps, and a press release issued by that agency relating the tragic circumstances of her death.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House:

We express the profound grief of entire Filipino nation at the death of two fine young persons, Nancy Boyd and Philip Maggard, of the Peace Corps, in airplane crash here. Their work in our country will long live in the hearts of our people. Kindly convey our sorrow to the American people.

President DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL.

PEACE CORPS

Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As you know, Nancy Boyd had served with the Peace Corps since June 1962. She graduated in 1960 from Alhambra Union High School in Martinez, Calif., where she was a fine student and an active member of the student council. She worked two summers for the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill and had served as a practice elementary school teacher in Martinez. Nancy was studying for a degree in history from the University of California in Santa Barbara when she joined the Peace Corps last summer.

From the time she arrived at San Jose State College to participate in the Peace Corps training program for the Philippines, Nancy impressed members of the Peace Corps staff, the San Jose faculty, and her fellow volunteers with her warmth, enthusiasm, imagination, and her deep concern and interest in other people. She successfully completed the 8-week course in late August and left for the Philippines in September.

Nancy served as a teacher's aid in the small town of Mabini in Davao Province on the island of Mindanao. There, teaching science and English to elementary school children and deeply engaged in the work of the community, she won the hearts of all with whom she worked. One of 630 Peace Corps volunteers in the Philippines, she was making a significant personal contribution to the development of the nation's educational system.

Returning to Mabini on March 3 from a Peace Corps training seminar in Zamboanga, the plane in which Nancy was flying crashed on a remote mountain in eastern Mindanao leaving no survivors.

Sometime ago, describing her reasons for serving in the Peace Corps, Nancy wrote: "I think that understanding between peoples cannot help but lead to peace. * * * I believe that I could find much common ground with other peoples and that we are basically alike in many ways. Because of this belief in basic similarities I feel that by serving in the Peace Corps I could have a part in preserving the peace."

Nancy lived this part she described admirably. She was an outstanding Peace Corps volunteer. Her death represents not only a great personal loss to the Boyd family but a loss to our country as well.

If you can think of any way in which we can be of further assistance to Mr. and Mrs. Boyd, please do not hesitate to call me.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

BILL MOYERS,
Acting Director.

PEACE CORPS PRESS RELEASE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Director of the Peace Corps, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and the superintendent of the schools in which they worked, paid tribute today to two Peace Corps volunteers who were killed Friday in the crash of a Philippine airliner on Mindanao Island.

The volunteers were Nancy Ann Boyd, 20, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, of 805 Lafayette St., Martinez, Calif., and Philip Walter Maggard, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Merida Maggard, of 207 S. Lobban Avenue, Buffalo, Wyo.

Both Miss Boyd and Mr. Maggard entered Peace Corps training in June 1962, as members of the seventh contingent of volunteers to be assigned to the Philippines.

After completing training at San Jose State College in California, they arrived in the Philippines in September and were assigned as elementary school teachers on the island of Mindanao.

Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director, said: "I extend my deepest sympathies to the parents and friends of these fine young people. Nancy and Phil were both outstanding volunteers who were performing a valuable service to their country and to the Philippines."

The Philippine Ambassador to the United States, Amelito R. Mutuc, said the death of the volunteers "is a great and irreparable loss, not only to their parents, their country, and the Peace Corps, but also to the townspeople among whom they worked and to the people of the Philippines, for whom they dedicated their time, energy, and youthful ideals." He added: "Their loved ones should

find consolation, indeed, inner satisfaction, in the fact that they have died in pursuit of the highest ideals of their country and the free world."

The volunteers were described as outstanding Americans who were doing highly commendable work by the superintendent of schools of Davao Province, in which they worked. "They were very popular with our people," he said. "They will be missed greatly."

Funeral services for Miss Boyd will be held Saturday at 11 a.m. at the Connelly and Taylor funeral chapel, 1124 Ferry Street, Martinez, Calif. In lieu of flowers, contributions may be made to the Nancy Boyd Philippine Scholarship Fund, care of Mert Cerri, Bank of California, Martinez.

Miss Boyd graduated from Alhambra Union High School, where she was a member of the executive committee of the student council. She attended the University of California at Santa Barbara, majoring in history. She had worked during summers as a clerk-typist in the Contra Costa County school department and as an apprentice library assistant in the Contra Costa County library.

In her application for service as a Peace Corps volunteer, she noted that, as a history major, "I have a high interest in peoples of all countries, and wish to learn all I can about them." She added: "Also, I have a strong desire to do my part for my country."

Volunteer Maggard had planned on a career in the priesthood. An Episcopalian, he had been a member of the Acolyte Guild at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., and vice president of the Canterbury Club at his church in Buffalo, St. Luke's. During one summer he had been church organist.

Of his plan to become a priest, he wrote on his application: "I have only 1 year of college left, and the idea of immediately entering seminary is rather frightening. For example, I would be ordained a clergyman at the age of 26 with practically no experience in the world itself. Since my ministry would be concerned with an attempt to help humanity, I feel that the Peace Corps would provide a way of gaining experience that would make that attempt more feasible."

He concluded: "And, having worked with the Peace Corps, I should hope to feel that I had left my area better than I had found it."

Besides the University of the South, he had attended the University of Wyoming at Laramie. During summers he had been employed as a State highway department crewman and as a printer's devil at the Buffalo Bulletin. He also had taught piano and organ to beginning students.

A CRITIQUE OF THE LAUSCHE TRANSIT BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] introduced an urban transit bill, S. 807.

Since a number of observations were made during the course of his introductory statement about the administration's urban mass transportation bill I have sponsored with 23 of my colleagues, I thought Senators might appreciate a few reflections on this important problem.

First, let me say how gratified I am to see this latest confirmation—notwithstanding the Senator's assertions to the contrary—that the problem of deterioration and decline of transit service in our cities and towns is truly a national crisis. How else can we explain the introduction

of this extraordinary billion-dollar bill of direct and indirect Federal support to perhaps every single public or private transit company in the United States?

The bill speaks for itself as to the gravity and national scope of the transit crisis. It makes me wonder whether the administration has not been entirely too modest and conservative in its approach to the problem.

Another important feature of the bill is its recognition of the fact that the severity of the problem is so great it requires what the Senator from Ohio described "at first blush would appear to be indirect Federal subsidies." And indeed the bill does provide subsidies, at first blush and at last blush.

But, Mr. President, while these are important concessions, coming from the leader of the opposition to effective Federal legislation in the field of urban transit, I must regretfully say that this is fundamentally bad proposed legislation, the justifications for which are filled with inconsistencies and contradictions.

I cannot help concluding that a vote for the bill will be a vote against helping our cities to alleviate the growing problem of traffic congestion and to provide genuinely improved public transportation service for the millions of bus, rail, and rapid transit riders of the country who want and need modern, dependable, and reasonably priced transit service.

I shall now discuss some of the contradictions that have been presented, and explain why the bill is so ill-conceived, unsound, and extreme.

I believe the analysis will demonstrate without doubt that the administration's proposal is infinitely more modest and sound.

I believe the analysis will also demonstrate that it is the bill of the Senator from Ohio, not the administration's bill, which runs the grave risk of wholesale intervention by the Federal Government into the rights and responsibilities of State and local governments and private enterprise—Federal intervention into everything from profits to working conditions in local transit systems.

THE CONTRADICTIONS

The Senator from Ohio charges that the administration's bill is a permanent subsidy program, whereas his does "not involve the Federal Government in a costly and permanent subsidy program."

The fact is, if Senators will take the trouble to examine both bills, that the exact reverse is true.

A subsidy is a form of Federal financial assistance given directly to a private enterprise. The administration's bill provides capital grants to public bodies for mass transportation facilities and equipment. The bill of the Senator from Ohio is a genuine subsidy through the granting of tax relief to potentially every private transit company in the country, regardless of need.

The administration's bill clearly terminates at the end of 3 years. The bill of the Senator from Ohio provides tax relief which, once granted, is permanent.

It provides another form of Federal involvement which, once enacted, will last a minimum of 50 years.

The Senator from Ohio asserts as evidence that no national crisis exists—which his own bill belies—the claim that only the larger metropolitan areas, a few smaller ones, and organizations with a vested interest have expressed support for the administration bill.

I suppose none of us is free from some kind of vested interest. But the fact is that the mayors of the Nation support the administration's proposed legislation, the county officials of the Nation support it, many Governors support it, many chambers of commerce support it, organized labor supports it, the rail and bus operators support it, the planners support it, the housing and redevelopment officials of the country support it, homebuilders support it, savings bankers support it.

The fact is that not only Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and a few other lesser sized communities have expressed support for the bill. Over the course of the last 3 years, Congress has heard as well from Atlanta; Dade County, Fla.; Detroit; St. Louis; Seattle; Baltimore; Laurel, Miss.; Pittsburgh; Cape Canaveral; Oakland; Cleveland; and Montgomery, Ala.; among others. In addition, since the enactment of the mass transportation provisions in the Housing Act of 1961, the Agency has received inquiries and requests for assistance from more than 250 cities across the Nation.

FLAWS OF THE GUARANTEE APPROACH

What is proposed under title II of the Senator's bill, S. 807?

Briefly, the bill proposes that the Federal Treasury guarantee revenue bonds issued for the construction of wholly new rapid transit systems, or extensions thereto.

It is suggested that such guarantees would be available to either public or private transit agencies, but it is quite clear to anyone familiar with the subject that we are only talking about public agencies, for no private company is in a position to undertake such a large endeavor, and no city in its right mind would allow a private company, with the aid of the Federal Government, to walk in and on its own authority build a major new rapid transit system which would have profound effects on every aspect of that city's life.

This kind of transit operation has historically been a public responsibility, and actually it cannot be otherwise.

But the public transit authorities are public bodies, and, therefore, their bonds are tax free. What the bill provides, then, is a solid-gold windfall to private investors, who would enjoy not only tax-free interest on the bonds, but also no risk on their investment because of the Federal guarantee.

This proposal has several consequences, aside from providing such a luxurious windfall to the investors. For one thing, because it eliminates the element of risk, it eliminates the safeguards of prudence and careful scrutiny we

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1	Mr. Elder			WE	
2	OGC/LC				
3	file - Cuba				
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
<p>Remarks: Attached are three excerpts from the Congressional Record of Friday, 8 March containing remarks made on the floor of the Senate by Senators Mansfield, Dirksen and Young on the general subject of Cuba and the disclosure of intelligence information.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; width: 250px; margin: 10px auto;"></div> <p style="text-align: center;">Assistant Legislative Counsel</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
Assistant Legislative Counsel				11 Mar 68	
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

25X1

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3617

Jr., appealing to churches and synagogues to "bury religious laissez faire in racial problems." The need, the Peace Corps Director said, is for social action programs which will produce concrete gains. Such programs could end segregation in churches where it now exists, Shriver suggested, and "introduce Negroes to every social and community event which the church sponsors or participates in."

It is difficult to generalize about the role of the churches in combatting the evils of discrimination. Even in the Deep South, where strictly segregated congregations are the rule, there is a wide range of opinion among laymen as to the morality of discrimination and many religious leaders have spoken out courageously against it.

But we think it will be generally agreed that even in the North, the example set by such leaders often does not reach deeply enough into congregations. As Shriver suggests, the example is frequently not translated into social action on behalf of basic principles.

It has been our impression, one sustained by inquiry, that Minneapolis churches and synagogues are generally outstanding in their dedicated work on behalf of these principles. The part played by various religious groups in combatting residential segregation and their efforts to educate the citizen to his responsibilities under Minnesota's newly effective Fair Housing Act, clearly suggests the presence of a powerful leaven of conscience which does not stop short of action.

We do not mean to imply that much more could not be done by these groups or by the congregations which they represent. But the picture often drawn of a spiritual leadership reluctant to war on discrimination, and of a lay leadership indifferent to inequalities of racial opportunity does not, in our opinion, apply to this community.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Conference on Religion and Race was a most relevant expression of the same concern for human values that prompted President Lincoln to promulgate the Emancipation Proclamation. I commend the persons responsible for conceiving and organizing this inter-religious conference of historic significance.

A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY— CUBA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was conducting an executive hearing of the Internal Security Subcommittee. In consequence, I was late in getting to the floor, and therefore did not hear the statement made by the majority leader with respect to a continuing discussion of certain problems relating to Cuba. He was kind enough to let me see the manuscript of his remarks. I believe it is appropriate that I make at least this one comment.

I was curious, when, 20 months after the Bay of Pigs incident, and after it had lain dormant all that time, the Attorney General should see fit to bring the matter out on the front page of the newspapers. I was curious as to the reason and why, after it had languished for 20 months, new life was being breathed into what was, at the time it happened, a controversy.

I have an interest only in the truth. It was written on the ancient parchment, long ago:

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

I think that is good gospel and that is good philosophy and that is sound doctrine for government.

It was in pursuance of that doctrine that I laid the matter before the policy committee of my own party and asked whether they thought it ought to be explored and whether a further report should be made on it. I have been exploring it, although it has not been necessary for me to energetically explore it, because it has explored itself from time to time. The letters, telephone calls, and telegrams and other material which have come to me bearing upon the matter indicate that there is a high degree of public interest in this subject. I have been exceedingly circumspect in anything I have said with respect thereto. I have sought under no circumstances to prejudge the matter. I leave that to take place after an appropriate committee of the Senate, where both parties have representation may, after an evaluation of the testimony, has come to a conclusion, and when one can ask any member of the newspaper fraternity. That is as much as anyone has received from the minority leader on this point.

It was only when a distinguished Member of the Senate, on a television performance, indicated that it was "spilled milk" that I, perhaps inadvertently, mentioned that spilled milk is one thing, but spilled blood is quite another. When he said, "What do you mean by spilled blood?" I said, "Well, I simply mean that perhaps Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs operation, and you don't lightly cast aside spilled American blood."

I left it right there. But they worked their own will. They worked their own thinking upon that little morsel. May it be said to the everlasting commendation of the majority leader that he did then state on the floor of the Senate or in a press conference that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs.

I asked nobody for confirmation. I was no party to any conference or any session, at the White House or elsewhere, where such a disclosure was made. But the majority leader stated, so that all the world could note, that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Of course, it is no wonder that this disclosure has seized upon the imagination of our people. It is small wonder that it has intrigued the interest of the press. So people continue to conjecture: What was the truth? What is the truth? What did happen? That is the only interest I have in the matter. I do not like to see a gap in contemporary history that may someday be referred to as the Bay of Pigs gap.

If there is any merit in the old expression, it would have merit now; that is, that open confession is good for the soul. So why not lay all the facts upon the record and let us have done with it? Then the whole truth shall have been told, and our people shall have been sat-

isfied on that point. If there are other questions appertaining to Cuba which need discussion, they can be raised when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is chairman of a subcommittee which is investigating the question, will finally make his report.

So, Mr. President, for myself, I must insist that my own approach to the matter has been most circumspect. I have at no time and under no circumstance undertaken to prejudge the matter. I leave it right there until such time as an appropriate group or subgroup of this body can go into the subject further.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was very sorry to read in the morning newspapers that the Republican leadership has announced its determination to fight the bill which is now before the Senate—S. 20. I think it would be well for the Senate, particularly the Republican leadership, to understand the background and origin of S. 20 and exactly what it seeks to do.

Public Law 85-470 of the 85th Congress, signed by Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower on June 28, 1958, created an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The Commission was composed of four Senators and four Representatives, equally divided between the two political parties, plus seven public members appointed by President Eisenhower. Mr. Eisenhower appointed as the Chairman of the Commission Mr. Laurence Rockefeller, of New York. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON and I served on the Commission. Republican Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and WATKINS, of Utah, served on it for a time. They were succeeded by Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho, and Senator Thomas Martin, of Iowa. Senator Martin was succeeded by Senator JACK MILLER, of Iowa.

In 1961, when President Kennedy took office, Senator ANDERSON asked him to retain the Commission as it was constituted, even though it was predominantly Republican. This was done.

The Commission reported on January 31, 1962, after a 3-year study, including many detailed research projects. The Commission found—and I wish to emphasize that the findings were unanimous:

The [recreation] demand is surging. Whatever the measuring rod—visits to the Federal and State recreation areas, fishing license holders, the number of outboard motors in use—it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a foretaste of what is to come.

Not only will there be many more people, they will want to do more, and they will have more money and time to do it with.

Recreation "activity occasions" ran 4.4 billion in 1960. It is estimated that by 1976 they will run 6.9 billion. They will be more than 12.4 billion—tripled—by

2000. These calculations are based on extensive studies, including a poll of 18,000 persons by Census Bureau for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report continues:

After 3 years of research, and an aggregate of some 50 days of discussion among the Commissioners, the Commission has developed specific recommendations for a recreation program. The 15 members brought differing political, social, and resource-use opinions. During the course of the study and discussion, views of the individual members developed, and the collective opinion crystallized. The final recommendations are a consensus of the Commission.

Here on the very first page of the report are the personal signatures of every one of the 15 members—proof of their individual agreement to the statement and to the fact that the report was the unanimous consensus of all of us.

I invite the attention of Senators to the names of members of the Commission who signed the report, which is the basis for the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

The Chairman was Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York, N.Y.

From the U.S. Senate: Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; the late Senator Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; the junior Senator from Washington, Senator Jackson; and Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa.

From the House of Representatives, Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; former Representative Grace Pfoz, of Idaho; Representative Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska; and Representative John H. Kyl, of Iowa.

The Presidential Commissioners appointed—and I again emphasize that they were appointed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower—were:

Samuel T. Dana, dean emeritus of the School of Natural Resources, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, associate director of special activities, the New York Times, New York, N.Y.

Bernard L. Orrell, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash.

Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, Washington, D.C.

M. Frederick Smith, vice president, Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N.J.

Chester S. Wilson, former Minnesota State Commissioner of Conservation, Stillwater, Minn.

All these individuals were appointed by President Eisenhower, with the exception of Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, who was appointed by President Kennedy in, I believe, 1961 by reason of the death of one of the members.

Mr. President, the names to which I have just now referred give the background and parentage of the recommendations which are before us. Certainly this group is composed of distinguished Americans who have been appointed without regard to party. The entire

burden of the effort of the Commission was to do an effective, nonpartisan job, so that we could get a report which would result in general agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from the State of Washington for yielding to me.

I wish to say that I think the Commission, which was appointed by President Eisenhower without regard to party, was an excellent one, and made an excellent report to the present administration.

I had hoped, and I still hope, that the extremely important recreation industry and its development and expansion will not become involved in any way in party politics. It would seem to me to be very shortsighted, indeed, to let that happen.

Recreation is one of the most rapidly growing industries in the United States today, and it shows signs of growing in the future at an even more rapid rate.

With the development of technology and assembly-line production, it has become possible for our industrialists to turn out the same amount of equipment of all kinds with much less labor than the amount previously required. Now we must find some way to take up the slack in employment which automation is creating; and the recreation industry lies immediately before us, waiting to be developed to several times its present size. That is particularly true in the part of the country which I represent.

Not only would the recreation industry take up the slack in employment, insofar as operating recreational areas goes, but in recent years there has been developed in the recreation field a demand for much new equipment which was not even on the market a few years ago; and this demand creates new industries and new employment in them.

The recreation industry has created a great new field for investment in this country. Even in our small State of Vermont we see millions of dollars of new money being put into recreation areas annually and thus creating new markets for recreational articles and new jobs for persons who otherwise perhaps would be unemployed. All of this, Mr. President, contributes to the taxable income of the country. I know small towns in my State which 10 or 20 years ago contributed virtually no taxes to the State, but now make very substantial tax contributions, not only on the property there and not only through the employment taxes on those who work in these areas, but also through the tobacco taxes, the gasoline taxes, and all the other taxes. If that tax income were to be lost, its loss could spell disaster to the economy of the State.

In addition, Mr. President, we must consider the agricultural situation of the country. In that connection, in order to keep in economic competition, farmers have had to change their way of do-

ing business. They have had to double or treble the size of their farms, and they have had to purchase new machinery. All this has meant that thousands of small, uneconomic farms have had to be taken out of production. Then how were the small farms used? They were used as residential property; and more particularly, they now contribute to the recreation industry, for today there is a great demand for living accommodations for people who wish to come for a week or a month, or even to live there indefinitely.

In one ski area in Vermont, the manager of the operations told me that presently there is a shortage of 2,500 beds in that one area, and that 2,500 additional beds are needed in order to take care of those who wish to come from other parts of the Nation to visit or live there.

Mr. President, if we were to restrict this development in any way, if we were to turn down cold the recommendations which this Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower, has made, we would literally be taking the bread out of the mouths of our people, and possibly the recovery from the economic shock and loss caused by such action would not occur during this generation.

So I wish to support the Senator from Washington, and to state that I hope there will be no partisan position on this legislation or on legislation of this type. I hope we shall—as we did last year—enact this bill unanimously, so there could be no question about where we stand, and so that no one could charge any of us with obstructing the development of what is possibly one of the most rapidly growing industries in the Nation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont. As usual, he has approached this problem—as he has approached so many other problems—in a statesmanlike way.

It would be most unfortunate if this matter were to become a subject of bitter partisanship. Actually, Mr. President, if the objective is economy and saving money, then the implementation of this proposal, by both the Federal Government and the States, will be a way to achieve it. It will avoid a waste, both of human and of material resources. The States are undertaking all sorts of programs in this area; and those programs need to be coordinated with the programs of the Federal Government. We have an opportunity through S. 20 to utilize the resources of the Federal Government, and also those of the States, to carry out a long-range, coordinated program to deal with problems arising out of what has been so commonly referred to as the great population explosion.

As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, many great problems which are arising socially, economically, and politically as a result of our rapidly changing industrial technology. Our need is to find proper areas for recreation, not only for the youth of the country, but also for our older citizens. This

Whereas despite these public hearings and site a biased report on MH-30 by a U.S. Department of Agriculture interagency committee, the tobacco companies failed in their efforts to get a 50 percent discount rate on 1963 tobacco crop; and

Whereas the latest attempt by the manufacturers and exporters to force their will on tobacco growers by influencing through a punitive decree for identifying purposes the pricing of its tobacco treated with MH-30 to place the farmers completely at the mercy of the buyers; and

Whereas the fine cooperative spirit that long existed between the farmer and trader has been virtually destroyed by the mentioned unscrupulous tactics; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia.

That this body condemn the subtle, sly and secret methods attempted to discriminate against the tobacco farmers of the flue-cured and burley tobacco areas; and it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby impose censure upon all of those responsible behind the scenes battle to arbitrarily impose their unjust scheme to achieve economic gain at the expense of the farmer; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby deplore the circumventing of democratic processes in this matter relating to the use of MH-30; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend, urge and request that congressional investigation be conducted immediately into all aspects of this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Senators and Representatives, the Governors and commissioners of agriculture of the States affected and all companies purchasing tobacco in these tobacco belts.

In senate, read and adopted, March 5, 1963.

GEORGE D. STEWART,

Secretary.

In house, read and adopted, March 4, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,

Clerk.

CUBAN DISCLOSURES AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate on issues of foreign policy. It has never seemed to me that any reasonable concept of bipartisanship ruled out discussions—full and frank discussions—of such issues.

There is a distorted concept of bipartisanship which abhors Senate discussion. I am frank to say that it is sometimes espoused by Democrats in a Democratic administration just as readily as it is sometimes espoused by Republicans in a Republican administration. Bipartisanship, in this distortion, suggests that if you have something nice to say about the way foreign policy is being conducted, say it; otherwise do not say anything.

I think the record will show that I have never subscribed to that concept of bipartisanship in any administration, Republican or Democratic. Nor do I subscribe to it now. Mr. Kennedy did not subscribe to it as a Senator; nor does he now as President of the United States.

Cuba or any issue of foreign policy which may be of concern to the American

people is of concern to the Senate. Bipartisanship does not constrain silence in these matters in the Senate. On the contrary, it compels consideration. But the highest interest of the people does place the restraints of national responsibility—not Democratic, not Republican, but national responsibility—on all of us. We need to select our words with caution and speak them with care. It does not matter whether we call these restraints bipartisanship, patriotism, common national sense or whatever. What does matter is that we remain ever aware that the margin for error is close in critical foreign policy issues, and we cannot afford to fill it up with politics as usual.

I question the motives of no Senator who may raise the Cuban question. It would be wise, however, if each Senator who deigns to speak on this dangerous matter examined consciously and conscientiously his own motives. Each of us might well ask himself three questions: First, am I talking for a partisan purpose? Second, am I talking with the full realization that my words may help to drive the people and the President's course toward war, limited or unlimited? Third, am I talking with the belief that my words will help the President in his primary task of safeguarding the security of the United States and its national reputation for honesty, integrity and decency while he attempts to exert a constructive influence for freedom and peace, not only with respect to Cuba, but throughout the hemisphere and the world?

I ask the Senate to ponder these questions. I ask each Senator to ponder them and his own silent responses to them, for these are questions which sooner or later each of us will have to answer to our own conscience, if not to our electorates.

I would ask all Senators to ponder the statement of the late Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg:

I think the Senate is entitled, at any time it pleases, to use the advice clause of the Constitution to tell the executive what it thinks concerning foreign affairs. But I think it would be a tragic and unfortunate thing if the habit ever became general or too contagious because I respectfully submit, * * * only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by some sort of premature and ill-advised expression of its advice to the executive.

If there is to be public criticism of policy, in short, let it be wise, dispassionate and constructive criticism. If the President's course is to be questioned, let reasonable alternatives be offered and let them be reasonably debated.

With that as background, Mr. President, let me say that I looked with favor on the revival of Senate discussion of the Cuban question some time ago. It seemed to me that in defusing the Soviet missile threat on the island—I would suggest that all of us, in the Senate and

in the Nation, recall our feelings at that time—the President had also set the stage for useful Senate discussion of the Cuban situation. It seemed to me that wise and dispassionate consideration in the Senate would open up new thought and new ideas from which the President might benefit in discharging his grave responsibilities on behalf of all of us.

There has, indeed, been discussion of Cuba, but little of it has been dispassionate and even less of it has been constructive. What has evolved, instead, has been a trial of policy by press releases, with the size and sensationalism of the headlines which they produce serving as evidence, judge and jury. Some days ago I cautioned against the course this discussion was taking. I made a plea on the floor for consideration of the President's grave burdens. I did not argue against discussion. I argued for discussion couched in the restraints of reason, the restraints of high national interest. These restraints have not been visible. In my opinion, much of the discussion of Cuba by Members of the Congress is not helping this Nation; it is hurting it. It is not helping the President; it is hindering him. We have indeed had discussions of Cuba, but a discussion steeped in politics, panic, and the perversion of fact.

I have been reluctant to reach this conclusion, for it reflects no credit on the Senate. Nevertheless, I am compelled to it by the recent discussion of the report that four American flyers lost their lives during the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion.

I did not wish to reveal the contents of the report which I am about to reveal, but I see no alternative. When the distinguished minority leader noted that he had just learned of the death of the four flyers, I was asked by the press to confirm it. I did so. I did not know why the distinguished minority leader raised the matter, but since it was raised by him—and he is a most responsible man—I saw no point in refusing to confirm the fact. I thought that would be an end to it, for I could not conceive of any earthly advantage to the Nation in a public delving in detail into this matter. And I could conceive of many, many disadvantages to the Nation.

But I was mistaken—very much mistaken—Mr. President, if I thought that would be an end to it. On the contrary, the matter has been pressed and pressed, and to what end? Are we going to get closer to a solution of this critical problem of Cuba if we know every gruesome detail of the death of these unfortunate men, if we ascertain that 4, 8, or 16 Americans lost their lives in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs venture? Just what is it—what national purpose is served by this macabre fixation? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries when we take a dark and obscure function and throw so much light on how it operates that whatever value it may have for the security of this Nation is seriously compromised thereby? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries

March 8

when we suggest—as this fixation does—that Cuban liberty can be bought with hired, well-paid American pilots, if only we hire enough and then not only hire them to fly but also give them a free hand to determine by their actions the course of U.S. policy? In this connection, I read from a U.P.I. story of March 7, 1963—only yesterday:

When failure of the invasion appeared sure . . . one of the American pilots proposed a plan to bring the United States into the conflict. Aircraft with Cuban markings would strafe runways and drop a few bombs on areas inside the naval base at Guantánamo.

This is no secret. This is from the news files of the United Press International, March 7, 1963—in other words, on yesterday.

Is this the way those who are looking for political profit in this affair would have the life-and-death questions of the Nation decided? Or will they stop playing with fire and get behind the President, the one man, the only man, whom the American people, in their wisdom, have chosen to make the critical decisions?

No, Mr. President, I see no national purpose served by this discussion. But I do see others. Examine for a moment, Mr. President, the context in which the drums have been struck and struck again on this matter of the death of the flyers. Clearly, the impression was permitted to gain national and international credence—and if Senators do not believe it, they can read the front pages of any newspaper in the Nation—that the tragic news of the loss of these men was suppressed by the Kennedy administration. And if the Kennedy administration would suppress this information, how much more, indeed, might it not be hiding in the dark archives of the White House and the State Department?

I now read to the Senate, Mr. President, a report which I have obtained on what occurred:

Four Americans flying for anti-Castro forces apparently were killed during the ill-fated Cuban invasion when their cargo plane crashed in the Caribbean.

A spokesman for a Miami concern that had put the Cuban rebels in touch with the flyers said the four had been missing since about April 19 and are presumed to have perished.

The spokesman, Alex E. Carlson, a Miami Springs lawyer, said he represented the Double Check Corp., a concern that acted as a broker in locating flyers for Cubans attempting to overthrow Premier Fidel Castro.

Mr. Carlson identified the missing flyer as Riley W. Shamburger, the pilot; Thomas W. Ray, copilot; Leo P. Baker, engineer; and Wade C. Gray, radioman, all residents of Birmingham.

That report, Mr. President corroborates the story which has recently been revealed to the press by Members of the Congress. It was this report which I have in my possession which more than anything else led me to confirm the story recently released with all the tense trappings of an uncovered skeleton in the closet of the Kennedy administration. Where did I get this report which I have just read, Mr. President? Did I copy it from those who have recently revealed it with such shocking impact? Did I ferret

it out of the White House or the State Department? What is its classification? "Secret"? "Top Secret"? "Eyes only"?

I read the source, Mr. President: Dateline Birmingham, Ala., May 4—AP—from the New York Times, May 5, 1961—1961—page 11.

One year and 9 months ago, Mr. President, in the public press, we find the same story that is now being used as an uncovered secret to cast doubt on the veracity and honesty of the administration. This then is the great new revelation, the sensational new discovery, which set the tone for the revival of a great debate on Cuba, a news item which first appeared in the press a year and 9 months ago. Is this the sort of thing that helps the Nation? Is this the sort of thing that shed light on a most difficult and complex and dangerous situation? Is this the sort of thing that represents a responsible contribution by a responsible opposition to the Nation's policies on which the security and good name of the Nation depend? Or is it a glaring example of irresponsible politics, of panic politics at their worst? That is a cruel thing, Mr. President, to do to the families of those who died, and it is a reckless thing to do to the conduct of foreign policy. It would seem to me that those who have sought to build this matter into a mountain of suspicion and distrust of the President owe an apology to Mr. Kennedy. But even more, they owe an apology to the people of this Nation.

Mr. President, the CIA, under its Director, John A. McCone, performs a useful and necessary service for the people of the Nation. It has been very frank in attempting to put the facts before the Congress—in my opinion, too frank, considering the nature of its work. I think it is about time that those who directly or by innuendo charge that the administration is "managing the news" on Cuba acknowledge that these demands, if met, can only lead to a total compromising of the work of this Agency, an embarrassment not of the President but of the Nation. Perhaps that is not too large a price to pay for full information. Each Senator will have to make that equation for himself. But it seems to me that if full disclosure is what is desired, Senators might well consider drastically curtailing this function and this agency. For, in my opinion, the Nation will be done less harm by that course than by a public examination of each and every detail of these operations.

I say once more what has been said before, it would be best for those who have a penchant to play CIA Chief, Secretary of State and Defense to turn their attention to the legislative chores which confront them, to the needs of the people of the United States. If we must be the sleuths, let us find the culprits in the state of the Nation's sluggish economy. Let us get on with a tax cut which will strengthen the financial position of millions of Americans. Let us take an honest look at the principle of equal opportunity for all Americans, and how it is operating in practice. Let us probe in depth the educational needs of the Nation and the health and hospitalization needs. Let us take a hard look at

the strangulation and the decay of our cities. Let us penetrate in depth into the questions posed by automation and persistent unemployment now at a 6.1-percent figure.

These are matters of immense concern to the present and future of this Nation, no less serious than Cuba or any other problem of foreign policy. And it will take Senators and Representatives, not sleuths, to deal with them. It will take a hard wrestle with reality to face these facts and to devise public policies for dealing with them. The President has proposed. It is about time that this Congress began to dispose.

Let me reiterate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Montana still has no objection to dispassionate discussion of the Cuban situation on the floor of the Senate. However discouraging this political prowling over the dead may be, the Senator from Montana is still hopeful that reason will prevail in this body on Cuban policies and that this body will yet make the contribution which it can make. And so he welcomes the continuance of the discussion. But let me say again, if we are to call shots in this delicate arena as we see them, let us be reasonably certain that we have seen them before we call them. And if we are to try to move the cautious and deliberate policies of the President off the course of national peace, national security, and international decency, on which he has tried to set them, let us be sure of our intentions. If there are those who would continue with this reckless flaming of public emotions, let them at least acknowledge what they are about. This is not a child's game. It is not a TV thriller. To continue to toy with these questions as has been done in the recent past is to toy with the life of the Nation.

HARTKE URGES SUPPORT OF OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on my return from Africa last December, I urged through correspondence, Hon. Luther Hodges, the Secretary of Commerce, to consider the establishment of a Senior Peace Corps, comprised of retired businessmen who could devote some of their time to teaching their know-how to businessmen in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Everywhere I went in Africa, there was a desire for American business methods, which are admired by nearly all Africans. Also, they seem to be impressed with the hard work that is a badge of most American businessmen.

I assumed that if this were true in Africa, it must be true in other underdeveloped countries, such as some of our neighbors to the south of us in Latin America and South America.

For several weeks now Secretary Hodges, his assistant, Dr. Jack N. Behrman, officials of the Agency for International Development, the State Department, and I have discussed this most important project.

Recently the Agency for International Development announced that a pilot project, using the idea of a peace corps, comprised of senior or retired business-

bill—S. 20—is part of a desire on the part of all citizens—Republicans and Democrats alike—to meet sensibly this great demand which faces us.

This is not a wild-eyed program. I do not think Laurance Rockefeller and other businessmen on the Commission would jump off the deep end with a program which would hurt the economy of the Nation. This is a realistic program.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] pointed out that a number of industries in our country have been growing and flourishing—in fact, they are called growth industries—because they are oriented toward the recreational needs and requirements of our people. Recreation is giving employment and new opportunities for business and for working men and women throughout America. I wish to commend the Senator for the point that he has made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am speaking not only for myself personally, but I am also speaking for my State, which supports the bill (S. 20) and the subsequent bill (S. 859) which was introduced by the Senator from Washington, and upon which hearings are now being held. The State Director of Forests and Parks for Vermont had intended to testify in favor of that proposed legislation before the Interior Committee, but unfortunately we had too much snow, sleet, and rain, so that the planes did not fly and he did not get here. But he has sent me his testimony, which I have asked to have inserted in the record of the hearings. So I wish it understood that I am speaking not only for myself alone—although I believe everything that I have said—but I am also representing the position of my State.

Mr. JACKSON. We appreciate that. I think it should be brought to the attention of Senators that the bill before the Senate is a bipartisan bill. It is supported not only by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from Washington, but also the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], as well. We hope that the whole problem can be approached from that point of view. If we fail to do so, I think we will be rendering a great disservice to the country as a whole.

Mr. President, I should now like to turn to some of the recommendations made by the Commission.

The Commission made extensive and very detailed recommendations to meet the tremendously expanded recreation demand which is ahead.

They recommended not only a national recreation policy—by unanimous consensus of all the members—but also many specific steps which should be taken to implement that policy.

The national recreation policy unanimously recommended on page 6 of the report before me states:

It shall be the national policy, through the conservation and wise use of resources, to preserve, develop, and make accessible to all American people such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment and to assure the physical, cultural, and spiritual benefits of outdoor recreation.

Implementation of this policy will require the cooperative participation of all levels of Government and private enterprise. In some aspects, the Government responsibility is greater; in others, private initiative is better equipped to do the job.

The role of the Federal Government should be:

1. Preservation of scenic areas, natural wonders, primitive areas, and historic sites of national significance.
2. Management of Federal lands for the broadest possible recreation benefit consistent with other essential uses.
3. Cooperation with the States through technical and financial assistance.
4. Promotion of interstate arrangements, including Federal participation where necessary.
5. Assumption of vigorous, cooperative leadership in a nationwide recreation effort.

To implement this policy, the Commission recommended, among many others, the following specific steps:

It recommended that we set up and adopt a national classification system for outdoor recreation areas, to facilitate understanding, planning and management.

It recommended that every State develop a statewide recreation plan.

It recommended systematic and continuing research, both fundamental and applied, to provide the basis for sound planning and decisions.

At page 9 of the voluminous report it recommended as follows:

A BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

A Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be established in the Department of the Interior. This Bureau would have overall responsibility for leadership of a nationwide effort by coordinating the various Federal programs and assisting other levels of Government to meet the demand for outdoor recreation.

Specifically, the new Bureau would—

1. Coordinate the recreation activities of the more than 20 Federal agencies whose activities affect outdoor recreation.
2. Assist State and local governments with technical aid in planning and administration, including the development of standards for personnel, procedures, and operations.
3. Administer a grants-in-aid program to States for planning and for development and acquisition of needed areas.
4. Act as a clearinghouse for information and guide, stimulate, and sponsor research as needed.
5. Encourage interstate and regional cooperation, including Federal participation where necessary.

WHAT S. 20 WOULD DO

The Secretary of the Interior established the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation on April 2, 1962, in response to the report, issued January 31, 1962.

In other words, Secretary of the Interior Udall carried out the specific recommendations of the unanimous report of a bipartisan commission headed by Mr. Laurance Rockefeller.

The Bureau will do exactly what the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended.

Secretary of the Interior Udall transferred planning and State cooperation functions to it from National Park Service—duties imposed on that Service, as we all know, under the act of June 23, 1936. These functions were transferred and placed in the new Bureau. Secretary Udall did not have the other powers and authorities, as recommended by the Commission, to transfer to the new Bureau. So Congress has been asked to provide the authorities. The bill (S. 20) now before the Senate would direct and authorize the Secretary, through the Bureau, to first, maintain an inventory; second, prepare a system of classification of types of recreation areas; third, develop a nationwide plan, built on State plans; fourth, provide technical assistance as ORRRC proposed; fifth, encourage interstate and regional cooperation; sixth, sponsor, conduct, and assist in research; and seventh, encourage Federal departments and agencies to cooperate.

Incidentally, I might comment here that, the wonderful cooperation that now exists between Secretary of the Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is to be most highly commended. They appeared jointly before the committee yesterday to testify together in support of other proposed legislation in this same general field.

Eighth, to encourage donations to the cause—money, lands, and other property that may be of help.

BUREAU IN EXISTENCE

The next point I wish to make is that the Bureau is in existence. Last year \$1.1 million was transferred to it from the Park Service budget. In other words, the funds that the Park Service had for the functions that I have mentioned were transferred to the new Bureau. In the 1964 budget, which is now before the Congress, the request is for \$2.2 million. What I desire to emphasize is that this will be a small bureau, a service organization, and not a land-management agency. The director, Dr. Crafts, has testified that, as far as he can see, at the very outside the budget will never go beyond \$5 million. It will probably be considerably less than that, as a matter of fact at the peak.

There is no money authorization in the bill, because the Bureau is already in existence; and is a budgeted agency.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about the fact that this will be a sound, sensible, first step toward carrying out the unanimous recommendations of a very able commission, a commission which has approached the problem without regard to partisanship. I think it would be a serious mistake if the proposed legislation were even to pass the Senate by a narrow vote. Certainly it will pass, but I do not think it would encourage fairminded citizens, regardless of party, to undertake work in behalf of such important programs as the matter now pending before the Senate, if the programs are to be turned into partisan political footballs.

President Eisenhower tried to select people uniquely qualified to serve on the Commission, to approach the problems without regard to partisanship. Presi-

3620

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 8

dent Kennedy has followed the same approach, with the same attitude. President Kennedy is now seeking to carry out recommendations made by the original Eisenhower Commission.

Mr. President, I hope that when the Senate votes on Tuesday, it will give a resounding vote of confidence and support to all Americans, to all of our citizens who are interested in dealing with our recreation resources, and the future well-being of our children. I hope the Senate will give a large, healthy—even overwhelming—majority vote in support of the pending bill, S. 20.

Cuba
BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, yesterday I adverted to certain incidents surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba in April 1961, and I expressed then, as I express now, my sympathy to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in that ill-fated incident.

Reference has been made in this Chamber today, to that invasion, and reference has also been made to it by the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon. I should like to make some supplementary remarks on this same subject.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that any American men were killed in that abortive invasion. It is a matter of great regret that four fine American young men had the misfortune to be shot down.

The facts are that all of the four were mature men. One had been a test pilot, and a former World War II pilot. He was 37 years of age. His name was Riley W. Shamburger, Jr. It is stated that he received \$2,100 per month while he was training Cubans as aviators preliminary to the invasion, presumably in Nicaragua and Guatemala.

The second man referred to in the news item was, Thomas Ray, I find, 30 years of age at the time, and had just returned from military duty. Evidently he was not employed at the time he enrolled at \$1,900 a month to train Cubans.

The third, Wade C. Gray, was unemployed at the time he was hired. He had been a radio and electronics technician. He was 33 years of age.

The fourth man, Lee F. Baker, was 35 years of age. He operated a pizza establishment, and also had worked as a pilot.

So, Mr. President, they were mature men. They were either recruited, or offered their services; one at \$2,100 a month and the others at \$1,900 a month. Their recruitment was for the purpose of training Cuban exiles. Their recruitment was not for the purpose of combat duty. Evidently in the excitement of the moment at the time of the invasion, realizing there was a need for trained pilots, they voluntarily took over the controls of two planes. Unfortunately, both of them were shot down.

Since that time there have been statements back and forth regarding these men. Let us accept the statements of the unfortunate widows, the mothers of their children, that their hus-

bands were not soldiers of fortune. But they were mature men who entered this perilous work, one might say, at high salaries. Their widows are presently receiving \$487 a month.

Mr. President, I have done some research on the subject of pensions for widows of servicemen killed in combat. If a captain in the Air Force serving in World War II were shot down, as these men serving in the invasion were, the widow of that captain, without a child, would be entitled to receive approximately \$164 a month from a grateful government until such time as she remarried.

Unfortunately, during World War II many Air Force officers with the rank of captain who had little children were shot down.

If the widow had one child, she would be receiving, from a grateful government, \$205 a month up to the time that the child reaches 18 years of age. With two children, the widow would receive \$225 from our Government. When her children reach 18—and presumably they have by this time—the payment of the pension to the widow, if she has not remarried, would revert to \$164.

I stated yesterday that some of the widows of our men in World War II, who left their comfortable homes and loved ones and made the ultimate sacrifice for their country, and who today are receiving \$164 a month, must be somewhat surprised to read in the papers that the widows of these four unfortunate pilots who were killed at the Bay of Pigs invasion in April of 1961 are receiving \$487 a month and expect to receive that amount as long as they remain unmarried.

I make these remarks only to show what our Government has done and what is being done—I do not know for sure by whom. It may be the Central Intelligence Agency or an organization of Cuban freedom fighters, many of whom are sons of men of wealth in Cuba who were dispossessed. Presumably it is not from that source. I have no knowledge on the subject, but my view is that it may be the Central Intelligence Agency that is making the payments.

That leads me to the conclusion that it would be an excellent idea for the Congress to legislate and select a joint watchdog committee to keep the CIA under observation and see that the expenditures of the organization are properly made. Sometimes, when agencies of our Government have ample funds to spend, some of the officials may not always be zealous in the interest of saving taxpayers' money. My belief is that our Central Intelligence Agency is over staffed and is spending too much of the taxpayers' money. Frankly, I could not prove that. No Member of Congress could. This is another reason why there should be a joint committee of Congress to act as watchdog, and to keep the expenditures and operations of the CIA under constant scrutiny.

Frankly, Mr. President, I have supported appropriations for the defense of our country, which includes tremendous sums for the CIA. I am fearful that having available such huge funds and

being top heavy with executives has encouraged this agency to be spendthrift on occasions. It is high time we become more vigilant and work hard to cut out unnecessary spending and lop off unneeded personnel in the CIA and other agencies.

Mr. President, I wish to add one concluding thought which comes to me because I have just taken from the bulletin board a report of a statement by former Vice President Nixon, who said in an interview that he has changed his mind about withdrawing from public life.

That is not surprising, and he certainly has the right to change his mind about retiring from public life. It occurs to me it is quite likely that he will try to continue in public life and in the end become California's Harold Stassen. Richard Nixon and Harold Stassen have both in the past been the wonder boys of the Republican Party. I recall that Harold Stassen served as Governor of Minnesota, and then sought the presidential nomination of that Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member, but which I hold in the highest respect. He later occupied an exceedingly high position in the Eisenhower administration.

Finally, as I recall, I believe he ran for the city council in Philadelphia and was defeated.

Mr. President, Mr. Nixon, according to this news item, charged that President Kennedy blundered by failing to provide air cover for the invasion that could have toppled, he says, the Fidel Castro regime, and, he says, former President Eisenhower would never have made that mistake.

The fact is that in 1960, when General Eisenhower was President of the United States, and this California Stassen, Mr. Nixon, was Vice President of the United States, the Castro regime suddenly, and without warning, seized the property of American citizens in Cuba; seized, for instance, millions of dollars of the property of American corporations which were lawfully in Cuba.

Fidel Castro made no pretext then, and has made no pretext since, of giving any payment whatever to corporations owned by American stockholders, or to American individuals when he despoiled them of their properties.

Was there a peep out of the Vice President at that time about a quarantine against Cuba? Was there an utterance from the then President of the United States about invading Cuba? Firm action would have been justified. Vice President Nixon did not utter one yelp, one cry of protest at that time. Now he is talking big. He wants to be a War Hawk in 1963, but he was extremely silent in 1959 and 1960, when the then administration and its leaders also had a real grievance against Castro's Cuba.

I support the firm, determined, resolute, and unyielding policy toward Cuba of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I am proud of the fact that his policy caused Khrushchev to turn tail last October and to withdraw the aggressive missiles and the aggressive planes from that little island.

I am proud, as a supporter of the foreign policy of the administration, that we are pursuing a policy of isolation and insulation against Castro's Cuba. In the end, despite what the new War Hawks, such as Mr. Nixon, have to say, I am certain that Castroism and Castro himself will be ousted entirely from the Western Hemisphere, due to the wise policy of the administration.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of answering my very able friend from Ohio, except to say that the hazards which confront this Nation are common to all the American people and that the incorrect decisions which are attributable to the man in the White House—any man in the White House—concern all of us. No one devoted more zeal or more courage to the cause of America and a just peace in the world than the gallant man from Gettysburg, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I remember that when Eisenhower finally decided to break off diplomatic relations with the infamous Castro regime this Chamber resounded with imprecations from some quarters against him for taking that step. I remember how proud I was when I stood on the floor to see the Democratic majority leader join the Republican minority leader in urging the Senate to approve legislation in the field of sugar and sugar quotas, by which that ugly Communist island would be prohibited from profiting from the sale of its sugar to this country. The Senate approved the Eisenhower bill only to see it die in the House. It is to the credit of the present Chief Executive of the United States, John F. Kennedy, that when he became President he asked Congress to enact the same kind of law recommended by a Republican administration and Congress did at long last do so.

Therefore, I simply say that in my opinion there is no need for anyone to defend the illustrious career in the White House of Dwight Eisenhower and of the Vice President at that time, Richard Nixon.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GALLANT NANCY BOYD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during its brief period of operation, the Peace Corps has won global admiration for the devotion, perseverance, willingness, and zeal of self-sacrificing men and women, of all ages and from every walk of life, who answered a unique call to service in the interest of democracy and of humanity.

The performance of the Corps indeed has demonstrated in remote corners of the earth the lofty ideals of America and the limitless sympathy which our Nation feels for those in less fortunate circumstances.

When they responded to the call, the Peace Corps volunteers signified a complete readiness to assume extraordinary responsibilities. They eagerly underwent rigorous training. They were content with unusually modest compensa-

tion. They were prepared to undergo physical hardship and to embark upon a mode of living far removed from the comfortable circumstances to which they were accustomed.

Now, in a tragic airplane accident in a foreign land, two members of the Peace Corps have given their lives. A resident of my State of California, Miss Nancy Boyd, of Martinez, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, was one. The other was Philip Water Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo.

Miss Boyd early joined this constructive program because she felt she could make a worthwhile contribution as a teacher, carrying the message of independence and self-determination and the dignity of man to younger generations who ultimately will be charged with keeping the flame of freedom glowing. In less than a year, as a member of the seventh contingent of volunteers sent to the Philippine Republic, this young woman, who received her training at San Jose State College in California, lay dead in the wreckage of a commercial airliner which crashed on Mindanao Island.

This patriotic young Californian, motivated by thoughts of the great opportunity offered in inculcating a love of liberty along with precious knowledge in children of another race and in a distant country, will be long remembered as a heroine of the cold war. I wish to pay tribute to her loyalty and her dedication to the cause for which she gave her life.

With these remarks, I wish to extend deepest sympathy to her parents and as evidence of the esteem and appreciation felt for her I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a message of sympathy from the President of the Philippine Republic, along with a letter from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps, and a press release issued by that agency relating the tragic circumstances of her death.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House:

We express the profound grief of entire Filipino nation at the death of two fine young persons, Nancy Boyd and Philip Maggard, of the Peace Corps, in airplane crash here. Their work in our country will long live in the hearts of our people. Kindly convey our sorrow to the American people.

President DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL.

PEACE CORPS
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As you know, Nancy Boyd had served with the Peace Corps since June 1962. She graduated in 1960 from Alhambra Union High School in Martinez, Calif., where she was a fine student and an active member of the student council. She worked two summers for the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill and had served as a practice elementary school teacher in Martinez. Nancy was studying for a degree in history from the University of California in Santa Barbara when she joined the Peace Corps last summer.

From the time she arrived at San Jose State College to participate in the Peace Corps training program for the Philippines, Nancy impressed members of the Peace Corps staff, the San Jose faculty, and her fellow volunteers with her warmth, enthusiasm, imagination, and her deep concern and interest in other people. She successfully completed the 8-week course in late August and left for the Philippines in September.

Nancy served as a teacher's aid in the small town of Mabini in Davao Province on the island of Mindanao. There, teaching science and English to elementary school children and deeply engaged in the work of the community, she won the hearts of all with whom she worked. One of 630 Peace Corps volunteers in the Philippines, she was making a significant personal contribution to the development of the nation's educational system.

Returning to Mabini on March 3 from a Peace Corps training seminar in Zamboanga, the plane in which Nancy was flying crashed on a remote mountain in eastern Mindanao leaving no survivors.

Sometime ago, describing her reasons for serving in the Peace Corps, Nancy wrote: "I think that understanding between peoples cannot help but lead to peace. * * * I believe that I could find much common ground with other peoples and that we are basically alike in many ways. Because of this belief in basic similarities I feel that by serving in the Peace Corps I could have a part in preserving the peace."

Nancy lived this part she described admirably. She was an outstanding Peace Corps volunteer. Her death represents not only a great personal loss to the Boyd family but a loss to our country as well.

If you can think of any way in which we can be of further assistance to Mr. and Mrs. Boyd, please do not hesitate to call me.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

BILL MOYERS,
Acting Director.

PEACE CORPS PRESS RELEASE,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Director of the Peace Corps, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and the superintendent of the schools in which they worked, paid tribute today to two Peace Corps volunteers who were killed Friday in the crash of a Philippine airliner on Mindanao Island.

The volunteers were Nancy Ann Boyd, 20, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, of 805 Lafayette St., Martinez, Calif., and Philip Walter Maggard, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Merida Maggard, of 207 S. Lobban Avenue, Buffalo, Wyo.

Both Miss Boyd and Mr. Maggard entered Peace Corps training in June 1962, as members of the seventh contingent of volunteers to be assigned to the Philippines.

After completing training at San Jose State College in California, they arrived in the Philippines in September and were assigned as elementary school teachers on the island of Mindanao.

Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director, said: "I extend my deepest sympathies to the parents and friends of these fine young people. Nancy and Phil were both outstanding volunteers who were performing a valuable service to their country and to the Philippines."

The Philippine Ambassador to the United States, Amelito R. Mutuc, said the death of the volunteers "is a great and irreparable loss, not only to their parents, their country, and the Peace Corps, but also to the townspeople among whom they worked and to the people of the Philippines, for whom they dedicated their time, energy, and youthful ideals." He added: "Their loved ones should

and consolation, indeed, inner satisfaction, in the fact that they have died in pursuit of the highest ideals of their country and the free world."

The volunteers were described as outstanding Americans who were doing highly commendable work by the superintendent of schools of Davao Province, in which they worked. "They were very popular with our people," he said. "They will be missed greatly."

Funeral services for Miss Boyd will be held Saturday at 11 a.m. at the Connelly and Taylor funeral chapel, 1124 Ferry Street, Martinez, Calif. In lieu of flowers, contributions may be made to the Nancy Boyd Philippine Scholarship Fund, care of Mert Cerri, Bank of California, Martinez.

Miss Boyd graduated from Alhambra Union High School, where she was a member of the executive committee of the student council. She attended the University of California at Santa Barbara, majoring in history. She had worked during summers as a clerk-typist in the Contra Costa County school department and as an apprentice library assistant in the Contra Costa County library.

In her application for service as a Peace Corps volunteer, she noted that, as a history major, "I have a high interest in peoples of all countries, and wish to learn all I can about them." She added: "Also, I have a strong desire to do my part for my country."

Volunteer Maggard had planned on a career in the priesthood. An Episcopalian, he had been a member of the Acolyte Guild at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., and vice president of the Canterbury Club at his church in Buffalo, St. Luke's. During one summer he had been church organist.

Of his plan to become a priest, he wrote on his application: "I have only 1 year of college left, and the idea of immediately entering seminary is rather frightening. For example, I would be ordained a clergyman at the age of 26 with practically no experience in the world itself. Since my ministry would be concerned with an attempt to help humanity, I feel that the Peace Corps would provide a way of gaining experience that would make that attempt more feasible."

He concluded: "And, having worked with the Peace Corps, I should hope to feel that I had left my area better than I had found it."

Besides the University of the South, he had attended the University of Wyoming at Laramie. During summers he had been employed as a State highway department crewman and as a printer's devil at the Buffalo Bulletin. He also had taught piano and organ to beginning students.

A CRITIQUE OF THE LAUSCHE TRANSIT BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] introduced an urban transit bill, S. 807.

Since a number of observations were made during the course of his introductory statement about the administration's urban mass transportation bill I have sponsored with 23 of my colleagues, I thought Senators might appreciate a few reflections on this important problem.

First, let me say how gratified I am to see this latest confirmation— notwithstanding the Senator's assertions to the contrary—that the problem of deterioration and decline of transit service in our cities and towns is truly a national crisis. How else can we explain the introduction

of this extraordinary billion-dollar bill of direct and indirect Federal support to perhaps every single public or private transit company in the United States?

The bill speaks for itself as to the gravity and national scope of the transit crisis. It makes me wonder whether the administration has not been entirely too modest and conservative in its approach to the problem.

Another important feature of the bill is its recognition of the fact that the severity of the problem is so great it requires what the Senator from Ohio described "at first blush would appear to be indirect Federal subsidies." And indeed the bill does provide subsidies, at first blush and at last blush.

But, Mr. President, while these are important concessions, coming from the leader of the opposition to effective Federal legislation in the field of urban transit, I must regrettably say that this is fundamentally bad proposed legislation, the justifications for which are filled with inconsistencies and contradictions.

I cannot help concluding that a vote for the bill will be a vote against helping our cities to alleviate the growing problem of traffic congestion and to provide genuinely improved public transportation service for the millions of bus, rail, and rapid transit riders of the country who want and need modern, dependable, and reasonably priced transit service.

I shall now discuss some of the contradictions that have been presented, and explain why the bill is so ill-conceived, unsound, and extreme.

I believe the analysis will demonstrate without doubt that the administration's proposal is infinitely more modest and sound.

I believe the analysis will also demonstrate that it is the bill of the Senator from Ohio, not the administration's bill, which runs the grave risk of wholesale intervention by the Federal Government into the rights and responsibilities of State and local governments and private enterprise—Federal intervention into everything from profits to working conditions in local transit systems.

THE CONTRADICTIONS

The Senator from Ohio charges that the administration's bill is a permanent subsidy program, whereas his does "not involve the Federal Government in a costly and permanent subsidy program."

The fact, is, if Senators will take the trouble to examine both bills, that the exact reverse is true.

A subsidy is a form of Federal financial assistance given directly to a private enterprise. The administration's bill provides capital grants to public bodies for mass transportation facilities and equipment. The bill of the Senator from Ohio is a genuine subsidy through the granting of tax relief to potentially every private transit company in the country, regardless of need.

The administration's bill clearly terminates at the end of 3 years. The bill of the Senator from Ohio provides tax relief which, once granted, is permanent.

It provides another form of Federal involvement which, once enacted, will last a minimum of 50 years.

The Senator from Ohio asserts as evidence that no national crisis exists—which his own bill belies—the claim that only the larger metropolitan areas, a few smaller ones, and organizations with a vested interest have expressed support for the administration bill.

I suppose none of us is free from some kind of vested interest. But the fact is that the mayors of the Nation support the administration's proposed legislation, the county officials of the Nation support it, many Governors support it, many chambers of commerce support it, organized labor supports it, the rail and bus operators support it, the planners support it, the housing and redevelopment officials of the country support it, homebuilders support it, savings bankers support it.

The fact is that not only Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and a few other lesser sized communities have expressed support for the bill. Over the course of the last 3 years, Congress has heard as well from Atlanta; Dade County, Fla.; Detroit; St. Louis; Seattle; Baltimore; Laurel, Miss.; Pittsburgh; Cape Canaveral; Oakland; Cleveland; and Montgomery, Ala.; among others. In addition, since the enactment of the mass transportation provisions in the Housing Act of 1961, the Agency has received inquiries and requests for assistance from more than 250 cities across the Nation.

FLAWS OF THE GUARANTEE APPROACH

What is proposed under title II of the Senator's bill, S. 807?

Briefly, the bill proposes that the Federal Treasury guarantee revenue bonds issued for the construction of wholly new rapid transit systems, or extensions thereto.

It is suggested that such guarantees would be available to either public or private transit agencies, but it is quite clear to anyone familiar with the subject that we are only talking about public agencies, for no private company is in a position to undertake such a large endeavor, and no city in its right mind would allow a private company, with the aid of the Federal Government, to walk in and on its own authority build a major new rapid transit system which would have profound effects on every aspect of that city's life.

This kind of transit operation has historically been a public responsibility, and actually it cannot be otherwise.

But the public transit authorities are public bodies, and, therefore, their bonds are tax free. What the bill provides, then, is a solid-gold windfall to private investors, who would enjoy not only tax-free interest on the bonds, but also no risk on their investment because of the Federal guarantee.

This proposal has several consequences, aside from providing such a luxurious windfall to the investors. For one thing, because it eliminates the element of risk, it eliminates the safeguards of prudence and careful scrutiny we